



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/684,152	10/10/2003	Allan O. Devantier	11336-434 (P03060US)	2307
81166	7590	12/24/2008	EXAMINER	
HARMAN - BRINKS HOFER CHICAGO			MONIKANG, GEORGE C	
Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. Box 10395			2614	
Chicago, IL 60610				

  

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/24/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/684,152	DEVANTIER ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	GEORGE C. MONIKANG	2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/15/2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Terminal Disclaimer***

1. The terminal disclaimer filed on 9/15/2008 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application has been reviewed and is NOT accepted.
2. The terminal disclaimer does not comply with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and/or (c) because:

Applicant used the wrong form. Applicant needs to use form for pending reference application not patent.

The attorney of record also failed to provide his/her attorney registration number.

### ***Double Patenting***

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1, 12, 17, 27, 29 (Application No. 10/684,152, hereinafter referred to as '152) are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending (Application No. 10/684,222, hereinafter referred to as '222). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The '152 claims 1, 12, 17, 27, 29 are broader recitations of the same invention claimed in '222 claim 1. Therefore, '222 claim 1 is encompassed by '152 claims 1, 12, 17, 27, 29. It is critical that patents issuing from these applications be commonly owned to avoid potential licensees from owing license fees to two different parties.

5. Claim 43 (Application No. 10/684,152, hereinafter referred to as '152) is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 40 of copending (Application No. 10/684,222, hereinafter referred to as '222). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The '152 claim 43 is a broader recitation of the same invention claimed in '222 claim 40. Therefore, '222 claim 40 is encompassed by '152 claim 43. It is critical that

patents issuing from these applications be commonly owned to avoid potential licensees from owing license fees to two different parties.

6. Claims 2, 5, 16, 18, 20, 28 (Application No. 10/684,152, hereinafter referred to as '152) are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 7 of copending (Application No. 10/684,222, hereinafter referred to as '222). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The '152 claims 2, 5, 16, 18, 20, 28 are broader recitations of the same invention claimed in '222 claim 7. Therefore, '222 claim 7 is encompassed by '152 claims 2, 5, 16, 18, 20, 28. It is critical that patents issuing from these applications be commonly owned to avoid potential licensees from owing license fees to two different parties.

7. Claims 10 & 14 (Application No. 10/684,152, hereinafter referred to as '152) are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 6 of copending (Application No. 10/684,208, hereinafter referred to as '208). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The '152 claims 10 & 14 are broader recitations of the same invention claimed in '208 claim 6. Therefore, '208 claim 6 is encompassed by '152 claims 10 & 14. It is critical that patents issuing from these applications be commonly owned to avoid potential licensees from owing license fees to two different parties.

8. Claims 11, 15, 26 (Application No. 10/684,152, hereinafter referred to as '152) are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 9 of copending (Application No. 10/684,208, hereinafter referred to as '208). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The '152 claims 11, 15, 26 are broader recitations of the same invention claimed in '208 claim 9. Therefore, '208 claim 9 is encompassed by '152 claims 11, 15, 26. It is critical that patents issuing from these applications be commonly owned to avoid potential licensees from owing license fees to two different parties.

### Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GEORGE C. MONIKANG whose telephone number is (571)270-1190. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F. Off 7:30am-5:00pm (est).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chin Vivian can be reached on 571-272-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George C Monikang/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2614

12/13/2008

Vivian Chin/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614